

Application No. 10/784,617

December 29, 2006

Reply to the Office Action dated September 29, 2006

Page 5 of 8

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheet of Drawings includes changes to Figs. 3 and 4. This sheet, which includes Figs. 3 and 4, replaces the original sheet including Figs. 3 and 4.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet.

December 29, 2006

Reply to the Office Action dated September 29, 2006

Page 6 of 8

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants AMEND Claim 7 and the Drawings.

The Examiner objected to the Drawings for allegedly failing to show every feature of the claims. Applicants have amended Figs. 3 and 4 to show the feature of the transmission axis of the first polarizer and of the second polarizer recited in Claims 1 and 7 and the feature of "at least one phase plate located at least one of between the first substrate and the liquid crystal layer and between the second substrate and the liquid crystal layer" recited in Claim 7. Applicants respectfully submit that support for these features is found, for example, in paragraph nos. [0053] and [0067] of the originally filed Specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection to the Drawings.

On page 3 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hashimoto et al. (U.S. 2006/0154041).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 1 and 6.

Applicants respectfully submit that Hashimoto et al. does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). MPEP § 706.02(f)(1) is directed to determining the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) date of a prior art reference. As explained in Example 5 of MPEP § 706.02(f)(1), Hashimoto et al. does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) because (1) Hashimoto et al. is a U.S. Patent Application Publication of a national stage application of WO 2004/053579; and (2) WO 2004/053579 was not published in English.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hashimoto et al.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art of record, applied alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in Claims 1 and 7 of the present application. Claims 2-6 depend upon Claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claim 1

Application No. 10/784,617

December 29, 2006

Reply to the Office Action dated September 29, 2006

Page 7 of 8

is allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 29, 2006

/Peter Medley #56,125/
Attorneys for Applicants

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850
Tyson's Corner, VA 22102
Telephone: (703) 637-1480
Facsimile: (703) 637-1499

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368
Peter Medley
Registration No. 56,125